

**REMARKS**

Claims 48-50, 52, 55-61, 63, 67-69, 71, 73 and 75-79 are of record. All claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112.

The Office Action is responded to by corresponding paragraph numbers.

1. The acceptance of the Substitute Specification submitted on April 4, 2003 is noted. This is referred to hereafter as the "SS".

2. No comment needed.

3. Drawings. A number of objections are made to the drawings.

The drawings submitted on April 4, 2003 have been disapproved as introducing new matter. The comments made by the Examiner appear to be more directed to a lack of specificity in the drawings.

The set of drawings at issue are those submitted on April 4, 2003 (hereafter called 04/04/03 drawings). The 04/04/03 drawings are basically formal versions of the drawings filed on February 1, 2000 (hereafter called "02/01/00 original drawings". Minor changes were made to the 02/01/00 original drawings as discussed in the correspondence beginning with the Office Action dated August 17, 2001 through the Office Action of April 26, 2002. In the Office Action of January 15, 2002, the Examiner indicated at page 2, point 3: "Figs. 3, 5, 6 are acceptable, and that Figs. 1, 4a), 4b) would be acceptable but need to be redrafted". At the time of the April 26, 2002 Office Action all of the drawings were accepted, except for Fig. 2.

A comparison of the drawings at the time of the Office Action of January 15, 2002 and the 04/04/03 drawings under consideration show that the principal change made was the elimination of Fig. 2 of the 02/01/00 original drawings. Figs. 3, 4, 5(a), 5(b), 6 and 7 as they existed on January 15, 2002 were renumbered as Figs. 2, 3, 4(a), 4(b), 5 and 6. Minor changes were made





c) the orientation of the focusing cone 11.

First of all, none of the features a)-c) are specifically claimed.

a) The acoustic optical deflector 12 is a schematic representation with conventional elements shown in block form and having reference numerals which are referenced in the SS.

b) Applicant would be willing to submit a new Fig. 2 which corresponds to Fig. 3 of the 02/01/00 original drawings. This shows a curved cable 3'. But the cable shape is not really part of the invention and as discussed above, the cable is a conventional element and can be of any shape.

c) The Examiner states that the shape of the cone 11 would produce distorted raster elements. Applicant again notes that the drawings are to be used as an aid in explaining the invention. A person of ordinary skill in the art would provide the necessary shaped cone when making the physical product.

The point directed to the "orientation" of each of the acoustic optical deflector 12, the light conductor 3' and the focusing cone is not understood.

Fig. 2 is to show only a general representation to aid in the understanding of the invention.

Fig. 3. Accepted

Fig. 4(a). Accepted

Fig. 4(b). The Examiner's position is that Fig. 4(b) does not show how all of the constituent blocks of the image plane are scanned together in parallel. The lens raster matrix is a conventional device. Each lens of a matrix forms the image of screen 1 thus forming copies of

screen 1 in parallel.

The Examiner questions the direction of the light beam 7. The specific direction angle of the light beam is not claimed. The illustrated Fig. 4(b) shows the beam at almost 90° to the screen. Again, this is for purposes of illustration.

Fig. 5. - what is shown in schematic block diagram form is a conventional device - "quantoscope". In such a device, a cathode ray beam emitted from a source (19) scans an active element plane (21) causing light to be emitted from that plane, having "an output having a resolution equal to that of the block of an image plane" (i.e., matrix light beam). Reference is made to page 12 of the SS. It is respectfully submitted that Fig. 5 is sufficient.

Fig. 6. The Examiner questions the shape of the light dividing matrix elements 18 and the lenses 23 as not being the holographic elements. This is not entirely understood. Page 16, 4 lines from the bottom of the SS describes the elements of Fig. 6 and calls for "23 - focusing element" whose function is described at page 18, line 16 of the SS to focus the picture forming light 7.

Fig. 6 is a redraft of Fig. 7 of the 02/01/00 original drawings. In the 04/04/03 drawings, Fig. 6, the tilt of one of the mirrors 18 was changed (by a draftsman error) from that shown in the 02/01/00 original drawings. An amendment to Fig. 6 is enclosed, which corrects this error.

It is respectfully submitted that the 04/04/03 drawings with the amended Fig. 6 are proper. Applicant's attorney again repeats his willingness to make any reasonable changes that





Application No.: 08,995,715

16

Docket No.: 00971/000D319-US0

Prompt and favorable action is requested.

Dated: October 29, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Gordon D. Coplein

Registration No.: 19,165

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

{W:\00971\000D319-000\00074754.DOC 15:00:00 10/30/2003 }